

DEPARTMENT OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



February 20, 1976

ALL-COUNTY LETTER NO. 76-37

TO: COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS
(or CHAIRMAN, COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS)

SUBJECT: REVISED FY 75/76 COST CONTROL PLAN

REFERENCE: All-County Letter No. 75-221

On October 17, 1975, the initial revision of the Administrative Cost Control Plan was released with All-County Letter No. 75-221. Subsequently, minor adjustments have been incorporated into the plan. This letter transmits the latest version of the Department of Benefit Payments (DBP) FY 1975/76 Cost Control Plan. For convenience, all revisions are designated by a line along the right margin.

The plan in its present form has not been altered significantly. Although intermingling of funds is not permitted between programs, it continues to be allowed within programs. For example, a county cannot utilize AFDC funds to finance Nonassistance Food Stamp operations; however, it can shift excess AFDC intake staff funds to AFDC continuing staff or support costs as the county desires. Transferability will be allowed within the limits imposed by the total program allocation, providing DBP is notified. Costs will be controlled in total and not by individual function. The allocations by cost item, i.e., intake staff, continuing staff, support costs, direct costs, and quality control costs, were provided as recommended targets to assist counties in the implementation of cost control.

If you have any questions regarding this plan, please contact the County Administrative Expense Control Bureau at 916/322-5802.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'G. Adams'.

GARY G. ADAMS
Deputy Director

Attachment

cc: CWDA
David Crippen, Local 535

GEN 654 (2/75)

A PLAN FOR CONTROLLING COUNTY
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR FY 75/76 .

I. Requirement for Cost Control

The following mandate is contained within the Governor's Budget of FY 75/76 in Item 291.

"Provided further, that during the 1975/76 fiscal year, the Department of Benefit Payments shall develop and implement a plan whereby costs for county administration shall be effectively controlled within the amount appropriated by this item; provided further, that the department shall seek the advice and assistance of the counties in the development of the cost control method; provided further, that implementation of the method shall be effective not sooner than thirty days after submission of the plan to the Chairman of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee."

In essence, Item 291 mandates that the Department of Benefit Payments shall do the following:

- A. Develop a plan whereby costs for county administration shall be effectively controlled within the amount appropriated.
- B. Seek the advice and assistance of the counties in the development of the cost control method.
- C. Implement the plan not sooner than thirty days after submission of the plan to the Chairman of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

II. Cost Control Methods to be Implemented

Because of the lack of time to completely analyze and develop methods of control for all programs contained within Item 291, the Department has developed cost control methods for only the AFDC and Nonassistance Food Stamp programs. These two programs represent in excess of 93% of the funds appropriated for Item 291.

The cost control methods for AFDC and Nonassistance Food Stamps are different and are detailed below:

A. Cost Control for AFDC

1. Types of Expenditures

- a. Salaries and employee benefits of eligibility workers and their supervisors represent approximately 50% of total costs.

- b. Salaries and employee benefits of clerical and administrative support staff represent approximately 33% of total costs.
- c. Operating Costs (space, equipment, utilities, EDP, etc.) represent approximately 14% of total costs.
- d. Direct Cost (fraud investigators and disability exams) represents approximately 3% of total costs.

It becomes evident from the figures presented above, that in order to control county administrative costs, the salary and benefit level and/or the work that these salaried employees handle must be controlled.

2. What is Workload?

Workload for the purposes of this plan and for controlling costs will be defined below. The amount of workload (cases or intake actions) that will occur during a year is uncontrollable, (i.e. recipients qualifying or applying for benefits) but given the fact that caseload growth and applications are estimated with a great deal of reliability, it then becomes a matter of determining how much workload the eligibility worker should handle.

- a. Intake actions per worker per month - This represents the number of actions (approvals, denials, restorations) that an intake worker completes during the month.
- b. Cases per worker - This represents the number of cases (received a grant, zero grant, etc.) that a continuing worker is responsible for during the month.

In order to obtain comparable fiscal and statistical data on a statewide and county grouping basis it is necessary to include specialized function workers within the group of regular workers in the area of continuing cases per Eligibility Worker. The following list includes, but does not limit, the specialized workers who may perform eligibility functions but do not directly carry a caseload.

- (1) Budget Clerks
- (2) Overpayment Units
- (3) Earnings Clearance Units
- (4) Fair Hearings
- (5) Reinvestigations

3. Time Period And Degree of Implementation

The cost control methodology will utilize a workload mean based on fiscal year 1974/75 data. This simple mean will be held constant for fiscal years 75/76, 76/77, and 77/78. However, DBP

reserves the right to reassess the mean at a future date if program changes occur which significantly affect the simplicity or complexity of the eligibility determination process.

The plan for FY 75/76 will be in affect for a nine-month period and establishes a tolerance band of 5% around the intake actions and continuing caseload simple mean to allow for county flexibility. Counties below the tolerance level will be limited to a 50% reduction during 75/76. This reduction will increase to 75% during 76/77 and 100% during 77/78. Support costs will also be controlled by the 5% tolerance band, but the reduction will be limited to 5% for FY 75/76, 76/77, and 77/78 or until the county is within tolerance.

4. Types of Expenditures to be Controlled

As shown in section II. A1 of the plan, there are four major areas of costs. In order to adequately control these expenditures the following methods of control will be used:

a. Eligibility Worker and Supervisors

This group will be controlled by separating staff costs between intake and continuing. A simple mean (see Attachments A and B) has been developed for both the intake actions per worker function and the continuing cases per worker function. Counties have been segregated into three groups (large, medium, small) by caseload size. A simple mean has been developed for the (11) large counties, and (14) medium counties. The top 25 counties represent approximately 94% of the expenditures and caseload. Specific means will not be used for the smaller 33 counties, but they will be limited to their prior year's expenditures plus appropriate cost of living features for FY 75/76.

The control methodology for the intake and continuing function allows a 5% tolerance level from the mean. In continuing function the tolerance level for the 11 large counties will be approximately 108 cases per worker. The 14 medium counties' tolerance level will be approximately 106 cases per worker. In the intake function, the tolerance level for the 11 largest counties will be approximately 19 intake actions per worker. The 14 medium counties' tolerance level will be approximately 21 intake actions per worker. Any of the top 25 counties below tolerance will receive an allocation

which will necessitate an increase in workload per worker by one-half of their variance from the tolerance level in FY 75/76. All other counties will be allocated funds per function based upon their actual FY 74/75 workload per worker measurement. For example, in the continuing function San Diego is 11.38 cases per EW below the tolerance level. They would therefore be required to increase their cases per EW by $(11.38 \times 50\%)$ to 102.46 (96.77 plus 5.69, see Attachment A and B).

b. Administrative and Clerical Support

This group will be controlled by applying a 5% reduction or the county's percent variance from the tolerance level, whichever is less in the area of support funds, to any county which exceeds the tolerance level by more than 5%. Because there is a substantial difference in the mean between the large counties and medium counties separate means will be used (see Attachment C). The bottom 33 counties as well as those counties with support below tolerance will be allocated support funds based on FY 74/75 expenditures plus their individual cost-of-living adjustment as reported to the Department.

c. Operating Costs

This group will be controlled in the same manner as expenditures in (b) above for the large, medium, and small counties. The only difference will be an 8.3% cost of living feature for all counties instead of an individual county cost-of-living.

d. Direct Costs

This group will be controlled by limiting all counties to their individual cost of living increase. Because of the small amount of funds involved (3% of total), control in this item is very difficult at this time.

The actual formulas to be used in arriving at the allocations are shown in Attachment D. The allocations will establish specific funding levels per cost item (i.e., intake staff, continuing staff, support cost, direct costs and QC costs). Counties will have the capability to intermingle funds between the individual cost items within the AFDC program. However, counties wishing to do so must notify the Department (in writing) at least quarterly, as to the reasons which necessitated the funds transfer.

5. Impact on Counties

The impact of these cost control methods on county welfare departments will be approximately a 1.9% reduction from FY 74/75 expenditures once an average 9.5% cost-of-living feature has been applied to FY 74/75 expenditures. The cost control methodology will have a direct effect on 19 of the top 25 counties in some area, while the limitation of FY 74/75 expenditures, plus an individual county cost-of-living increase will have an indirect effect on the other 39 counties in that they will be limited to last year's level of staffing as well as supportive costs.

The cost control methodology will produce a workload adjustment fund of approximately \$.95 million of state funds in the following areas:

- (a) Intake staff - \$200,000 - 13 counties
- (b) Continuing staff - \$240,000 - 9 counties
- (c) Support costs - \$510,000 - 8 counties

The cost control savings are based on nine months of control during FY 75/76 with the reductions equalling 50% of the counties' variance from the tolerance.

Adjustments will be made to individual county allocations when a county's workload for FY 75/76 changes from the level of FY 74/75. Significant increases in workload will result in an increased allocation provided the county's activity rate is at or higher than the level of FY 74/75 or the tolerance level, whichever is higher. Conversely, a decrease in workload will be reflected in a reduced allocation in the same manner.

The methodology has been developed taking into account that attrition of eligibility workers (approximately 25% statewide) will continue to exist and this is the method of reduction that should take place. The area of support costs has not been reduced as much as the eligibility costs because of the much lower level of attrition.

6. Uses of the Workload Adjustment Fund

- a. Provide total funding for the first quarter of FY 75/76 for those counties who do not reach tolerance levels for the entire year.
- b. Fund minor unanticipated workload increase in AFDC.
- c. Fund unanticipated increases in other programs contained within Item 291.

- d. Augment counties that are above tolerance and desire to increase staff.
- e. Provide funds or reduce funds to counties because of any major program or regulation changes made by the Department.
- f. Provide funds to those counties which the Department determines have an exceptional error rate and justify being controlled to a lesser degree for the first year.

7. County Advice and Assistance

- a. The Department in conjunction with the Department of Health established the Administrative Cost Control Advisory Committee (see Attachment E for membership). This committee consisted of 6 County Welfare Directors, 2 County Administrative Officers, as well as representatives from the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office. This committee reviewed all methodologies developed by the Department and made many recommendations that have been included within the plan. The Department also received assistance on a technical level from three county staff members (Sacramento, San Joaquin and Los Angeles counties) during the development of the plan.

B. Cost Control for Nonassistance Food Stamps

1. Types of Expenditures

- a. Salaries and employee benefits of eligibility workers and their supervisors represent approximately 41% of total costs.
- b. Salaries and employee benefits of clerical and administrative support staff represent approximately 29% of total costs.
- c. Operating Costs (space, equipment, utilities, EDP, etc.) represent approximately 13% of total costs.
- d. Direct Costs (issuance costs and fraud investigators) represent approximately 17% of total costs.

2. What is Workload?

Activity (workload) represents the number of intake actions (approvals and denials) plus the number of participating households. The workers to which this is compared are comprised of the total number of Eligibility Workers and their supervisors, and Quality Control staff working on the Non-assistance Food Stamp Program.

The lack of data in segregating the intake and continuing function in Nonassistance Food Stamps makes the workload measurement system to be used more gross in nature than the AFDC program.

3. Time Period and Degree of Implementation

The cost control methodology will utilize a workload mean based on FY 74/75 data. This simple mean will be used as the basis for the tolerance band during FY 75/76.

The plan for FY 75/76 will be in effect for a nine-month period and establishes a tolerance band of 20% around the mean and then limits the amount of reduction to 30% of the counties existing level (see Attachment F). In the area of support costs, counties will have a 5% tolerance band with a 5% maximum reduction.

A method of identifying intake and continuing caseload data has been developed for collecting data in FY 75/76. However, county allocations distinguishing between intake and continuing for the NAFS Program will not be implemented until FY 76/77.

4. Types of Expenditures to be Controlled

As in AFDC, there are four major areas. In order to adequately control these expenditures, the following methods of control will be used.

a. Eligibility Worker and Supervisors

This group will be controlled by using the simple mean (see Attachment F) developed for the Nonassistance Food Stamp Program. Counties have been segregated into three groups (large, medium, small) by caseload size. The simple means developed for the large and medium counties are different and each mean will be used for its group for allocation and control purposes. The top 31 counties represent approximately 94% of the expenditures and caseload. A specific mean will not be used for the smaller 33 counties, but they will be limited to their prior year's expenditures plus appropriate cost-of-living features and activity increases (based on FY 74/75 levels) for FY 75/76.

The tolerance level for total actions per EW in the NAFS Program will be approximately 114 and 117 for the large and medium counties, respectively. Counties below the tolerance level for their group will receive an allocation which will necessitate a minimum increase of their workload per worker by 30%. For example,

Los Angeles County will be required to increase their actions per EW by 23.74 ($79.12 \times 30\%$) to 102.86 (see Attachment F). Counties which are within or above the tolerance will receive an allocation based upon their actual FY 74/75 workload per EW measurement.

b. Administrative and Clerical Support

This group will be controlled by applying a 5% reduction (in the area of support) of funds to any county who exceeds the tolerance level by more than 5%. This is identical to the method being used in the AFDC program.

Separate means will be used for the large and medium counties (see Attachment C). The smaller 33 counties, as well as those counties with support below tolerance, will be allocated support funds based on FY 74/75 expenditures plus their individual cost-of-living adjustment plus funds for growth of the program.

c. Operating Costs

This group will be controlled in the same manner as expenditures in (b) above for the large, medium, and small counties. The only difference will be an 8.3% cost of living feature for all counties instead of an individual county cost of living.

d. Direct Costs

This group will be controlled by limiting all counties to an 8.3% cost of living increase and a percentage workload increase.

The actual formula to be used in arriving at the allocations is shown in Attachment G. As in AFDC, allocations will be made to specific cost items (i.e., EW's, Support, Direct). Funds may be transferred from one cost item to another within NAFS; however, counties must notify the Department (in writing) at least quarterly as to the reasons for the funds transfer.

5. Impact on Counties

The impact of these cost control methods will be very different than in AFDC. Because the program is growing at a rapid rate, funds will be allocated to counties based on the anticipated increase in activity (with cost controls in effect). It is

anticipated that rather than attrition being the method of reducing expenditures, counties below tolerance will not hire new workers to handle the increased workload until they reach the target level or tolerance level.

The cost control methodology will have a direct effect on 12 of the top 31 counties in some area, while the limitation of FY 74/75 levels for staffing, as well as support, will have an indirect effect on the other 46 counties.

The cost control methodology will reduce (if totally implemented) anticipated need of state funds by approximately \$1.8 million in the following areas.

- a. Eligibility staff costs - \$1,500,000 - 9 counties
- b. Support Costs - \$ 300,000 - 7 counties

The cost control savings are based on nine months of control during FY 75/76.

Adjustments will be made to individual county allocations when a county's workload for FY 75/76 changes from the level of FY 74/75. Significant increases in workload will result in an increased allocation provided the county's activity rate is at or higher than the level of FY 74/75 or the tolerance level, whichever is higher. Conversely, a decrease in workload will be reflected in a reduced allocation in the same manner.

6. County Advice and Assistance

The same committee structure (see II A-6 and Attachment E) was used for the Nonassistance Food Stamp Program.

TOLERANCE BAND METHODOLOGY

CONTINUING CASES/EW

AFDC

LARGE COUNTIES		<u>5% Tolerance</u>	<u>Target</u>
Contra Costa	95.61	(16.0% Below Mean)	101.88
San Diego	96.77		102.46
Los Angeles	102.54		105.35
Orange	104.03	---- 108.15	106.09
San Francisco	111.25		
Alameda	112.70		
Mean	113.84		
Fresno	115.85	---- 119.53	
Santa Clara	125.16		
Riverside	125.64		
San Bernardino	127.80		
Sacramento	134.92	(18.5% Above Mean)	
MEDIUM COUNTIES			
Kern	91.15	(18.7% Below Mean)	98.83
Merced	91.31		98.91
Tulare	95.37		100.94
Humboldt	96.19		101.35
Solano	103.50	---- 106.51	105.00
San Mateo	107.21		
Santa Barbara	110.71		
Mean	112.12		
Butte	116.04		
San Joaquin	116.28	---- 117.73	
Monterey	118.49		
Stanislaus	119.41		
Santa Cruz	129.61		
Sonoma	130.99		
Ventura	143.47	(28.0% Above Mean)	

TOLERANCE BAND METHODOLOGY

INTAKE ACTIONS/EW

AFDC

LARGE COUNTIES

		<u>5% Tolerance</u>	<u>Target</u>
Alameda	13.27	(36.0% Below Mean)	16.48
San Diego	13.94		16.92
Fresno	16.35		18.02
Contra Costa	17.24		18.47
Orange	18.92	---- 19.69	19.31
Mean	20.73		
San Francisco	20.73	---- 21.77	
Los Angeles	23.43		
Riverside	23.70		
Sacramento	24.86		
Santa Clara	26.36		
San Bernardino	29.20	(40.9% Above Mean)	

MEDIUM COUNTIES

Kerr	12.74	(41.8% Below Mean)	16.77
Humboldt	16.49		18.65
San Mateo	16.49		18.65
San Joaquin	16.50		18.65
Sonoma	18.76		19.78
Santa Barbara	19.09		19.95
Santa Cruz	20.11		20.46
Merced	20.66	---- 20.80	20.73
Mean	21.89		
Ventura	25.65	---- 22.98	
Butte	25.68		
Stanislaus	26.27		
Tulare	27.97		
Monterey	29.33		
Solano	30.72	(40.3% Above Mean)	

SUPPORT COSTS/EW STAFF COSTS

ALL PROGRAMS

LARGE COUNTIES

5% Tolerance

Los Angeles	1.31	(52.3% Above Mean)
Contra Costa	1.02	
Riverside	.98	
Santa Clara	.94	---- .90
Alameda	.88	
San Bernardino	.88	
Mean	.86	
		---- .82
Sacramento	.76	
San Francisco	.74	
Fresno	.73	
Orange	.69	
San Diego	.53	(38.4% Below Mean)

MEDIUM COUNTIES

Ventura	1.16	(26.3% Above Mean)
Santa Cruz	1.13	
Merced	1.07	
Solano	1.01	---- .96
San Mateo	.95	
Mean	.91	
Tulare	.87	
Stanislaus	.86	---- .86
Humboldt	.85	
Kern	.85	
San Joaquin	.84	
Santa Barbara	.84	
Monterey	.81	
Sonoma	.78	
Butte	.74	(18.7% Below Mean)

AFDC COST CONTROL FORMULA

Formula

I.	A. Intake	Intake Staff Costs* x c x (1+a)	
	B. Continuing	Continuing Staff Costs* x c x (1+a)	
	C. Quality Control	QC Staff Costs* x (1+a)	
	D. Subtotal		<u>Total Staff</u>
II.	A. Adm/Clerical Support	Adm/Clerical Costs* x d x (1+a)	
	B. Other Operating Support	Other Operating Costs* x d x (1+b)	
	C. Subtotal		<u>Total Support</u>
III.	A. Direct Charges	<u>Direct Costs* x (1+a)</u>	<u>Total Direct</u>
	B. Subtotal		
	Total County Allocation		<u>ID+IIC+IIIB</u>

Formula Codes

- a. Individual County Cost-of-Living Increase
- b. Statewide Cost-of-Living Increase for Operating Expenses
as Determined by DOF (8.3%)
- c. Adjustment Factor**, if any, Based Upon Workload
Tolerance Level (no minimum)
- d. Adjustment Factor**, if any, Based Upon County Support
Cost to Eligibility Staff Cost Ratio (95% minimum)

* Staff Costs, Support Costs, and Direct Costs represent FY 74/75 expenditures.

** There will be no adjustment factor for the 33 small counties.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

County Welfare Department (CWD)

Robert Whittaker - Merced
Dennis Denny - Mendocino
Dave Echols - Placer
William Redmond - Sacramento
Dean Richmond - Yuba
Don Quisenberry - Los Angeles

County Welfare Department Technical Staff

Lois Hansen - San Joaquin
Rod Nystrom - Sacramento
Ben Carlsen - Los Angeles

County Administrative Officers (CAO)

Art Will - Contra Costa
Charles Dixon - San Joaquin

County Supervisors Association of California (CSAC)

Dale Wagerman

Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)

Tom Dooley
Harry Osborne

Department of Finance (DOF)

Jim Phillips
Chon Gutierrez

NAFS - TOTAL ACTIONS/EW

LARGE COUNTIES		<u>20% Tolerance</u>	<u>Target</u>
Los Angeles	79.12	(44.6% Below Mean)	102.86
Riverside	112.64		114.33
Alameda	113.06	--- 114.33	114.33
Sacramento	136.25		
San Diego	139.26		
Fresno	140.56		
Mean	142.91		
Orange	144.87		
Santa Clara	158.64		
Santa Cruz	162.83	--- 171.49	
San Bernardino	171.92		
San Francisco	212.83	(48.9% Above Mean)	
MEDIUM COUNTIES			
San Joaquin	76.41	(48.1% Below Mean)	99.33
Kern	77.49		100.74
Merced	80.99		105.29
Contra Costa	86.31		112.20
Santa Barbara	100.41		117.80
San Luis Obispo	113.25	--- 117.80	117.80
Yuba	120.07		
Ventura	122.10		
San Mateo	122.73		
Tulare	130.83		
Sonoma	136.54		
Mendocino	136.87		
Humboldt	144.91		
Mean	147.25		
Monterey	151.09		
Shasta	182.56	--- 176.70	
Placer	187.79		
Stanislaus	224.24		
Yolo	232.99		
Marin	258.09		
Butte	259.27	(76.1% Above Mean)	

ATTACHMENT G

NA FOOD STAMP COST CONTROL FORMULA

I.	A. EW Staff Costs	$\frac{\text{Staff Costs*} \times c \times (1+a) \times (1 \times e)}{\text{Total Staff}}$
	B. Subtotal	
II.	A. Adm/Clerical Support	$\frac{\text{Adm/Clerical Costs*} \times d \times (1+a)}{\text{Total Support}}$
	B. Other Operating Support	$\frac{\text{Other Operating Costs*} \times d \times (1+b)}{\text{Total Support}}$
	C. Subtotal	$\times (1 + e)$
III.	A. Direct Charges	$\frac{\text{Direct Costs*} \times (1+b) \times (1 + e)}{\text{Total Direct}}$
	B. Subtotal	
Total County Allocation		<u>IB+IIC+IIIB</u>

Formula Codes

- a. Individual County Cost-Of-Living Increase
- b. Statewide Cost-Of-Living Increase As Determined
By DOF (8.3%)
- c. Adjustment Factor**, if any, Based Upon Workload
Tolerance Level (70% minimum)
- d. Adjustment Factor**, if any, Based Upon County Support
Cost To Eligibility Staff Cost Ratio (95% minimum)
- e. Percentage workload increase

* Staff Costs, Support Costs and Direct Costs represent FY 74/75 expenditures
 ** There will be no adjustment factor for the 27 small counties based upon
 Total Activity

AFDC 9 MONTH INTAKE REDUCTIONS

	<u>5% (50)</u>
Alameda	\$ 46,405
Contra Costa	9,758
Fresno	10,631
Humboldt	2,645
Kern	25,817
Merced	90
Orange	4,136
San Diego	80,745
San Joaquin	11,207
San Mateo	7,848
Santa Barbara	1,894
Santa Cruz	532
Sonoma	2,819
TOTAL	\$204,527

AFDC 9 MONTH CONTINUING REDUCTIONS

	<u>5% (50)</u>
Contra Costa	\$ 23,783
Humboldt	2,766
Kern	14,808
Los Angeles	134,769
Merced	5,867
Orange	7,607
San Diego	41,979
Solano	1,452
Tulare	7,466
TOTAL	\$240,497

AFDC 9 MONTH SUPPORT REDUCTIONS

Contra Costa	\$ 27,331
Los Angeles	409,841
Merced	5,668
Riverside	15,642
Santa Clara	29,838
Santa Cruz	5,410
Solano	6,734
Ventura	9,782
 TOTAL	 \$510,246

NAFS 9 MONTH REDUCTIONS

<u>County</u>	<u>Amount of Reduction</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>EW's</u>	<u>Support</u>	
Alameda	\$ 5,808	\$ --	\$ 5,808
Contra Costa	66,840	12,833	79,673
Kern	64,953	--	64,953
Los Angeles	1,233,377	271,371	1,504,748
Merced	18,352	3,261	21,613
Riverside	4,898	16,401	21,299
San Joaquin	68,812	--	68,812
San Luis Obispo	3,123	--	3,123
Santa Barbara	32,829	--	32,829
Santa Clara	--	22,511	22,511
Santa Cruz	--	8,661	8,661
Ventura	--	7,260	7,260
TOTAL	\$1,498,992	\$342,298	\$1,841,290